

#### 4.2.5 Post-election internet follow-up

Of the 4,161 respondents to the post-election wave, 3,907 agreed to be recontacted for a possible follow-up survey. Of these, 931 responded to the Internet follow-up. The weights created for the Internet survey were designed to fulfill two main purposes: correcting for unequal selection probabilities and calibration weighting to fit the profile of the sample to the (weighted) profile of the post-election wave.<sup>1</sup>

The selection weights used to correct for unequal selection probabilities were as described above. Using calibration weighting, the selection weight was adjusted by the algorithm described in Section 4.2.1 to ensure that the profile of respondents to the Internet survey was brought into line with the (weighted) post-election wave along the following dimensions:

- Age-group of respondent;
- Sex;
- Country;
- Whether had access to the internet; and
- Whether a supporter of a political party.

To avoid extreme weights having a large influence on the estimates the weight was trimmed at the 5<sup>th</sup> and 95<sup>th</sup> percentiles.

Table 4.1 compares the profile of respondents to the Internet survey to that of the post-election wave on these five dimensions. (Note that the profiles would have been identical had the weights not been trimmed). For example, 43.9% of the 4,161 respondents to the post-election wave were estimated to have had access to the internet at the time of the post-election wave, compared with 70% of respondents to the Internet survey. The weights for the Internet survey aim to bring the estimate of internet access (47.1%) closer to the post-election wave.

---

<sup>1</sup> Given the size of the achieved Internet follow-up sample, applying a non-response weight and adjusting it to match population estimates (by age and sex *within* England, Scotland and Wales) would have led to a rather large variation in the final weights. Such large variation decreases survey precision and could result in a few cases having a large influence on the estimates.

**Table 4.1 Post-election wave characteristics of Internet respondents**

<b>Characteristics at post-election wave</b>	<b>Internet follow-up (unweighted)</b>	<b>Internet follow-up (weighted by IntWtBr)</b>	<b>Post-election cross-section (weighted by postwtbr)</b>
	%	%	%
<i>Age-group</i>			
18-24	4.4	9.8	11.3
25-34	14.9	17.5	17.4
35-44	26.1	21.4	19.6
45-54	24.7	18.0	16.5
55-64	18.7	15.7	14.6
65-74	8.3	10.7	10.8
75+	2.9	6.8	9.8
<i>Sex</i>			
Male	49.1	47.5	48.2
Female	50.9	52.5	51.8
<i>Country</i>			
England	63.7	84.6	86.1
Scotland	21.5	9.8	8.8
Wales	14.8	5.7	5.1
<i>Internet access</i>			
Yes	70.0	47.1	43.9
No	30.0	52.9	56.1
<i>Party supporter</i>			
Yes	56.5	52.4	52.6
No	43.5	47.6	47.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>931</b>	<b>931</b>	<b>4,161</b>

Separate internet weights were computed for Britain, England, Scotland and Wales.

**Summary of weights for internet respondents**

	<b>England</b>	<b>Scotland</b>	<b>Wales</b>	<b>Britain</b>
Internet respondents	IntWtEn	IntWtSc	IntWtWa	IntWtBr

#### 4.2.6 Post-election internet follow-up (all waves respondents)

Of the 2,343 respondents to the pre and post election waves *and* who returned the self-completion questionnaire, 640 responded to the Internet follow-up. For these subset of Internet respondents, the aim of the weighting was to fit the profile of the Internet sample to the (weighted) profile of the 2,343 panel respondents (i.e. pre, post and self-completion) along the dimensions of:

- Age-group of respondent;
- Sex;
- Country;
- Whether had access to the internet; and
- Whether a supporter of a political party.

To avoid extreme weights having a large influence on the estimates the weight was trimmed at the 5<sup>th</sup> and 95<sup>th</sup> percentiles.

Table 4.2 compares the profile of the (panel) respondents to the Internet survey to that of the (panel) post-election wave on these five dimensions.<sup>2</sup> (Note that the profiles would have been identical had the weights not been trimmed). For example, 46.1% of the 2,343 panel respondents to the post-election wave were estimated to have had access to the internet at the time of the post-election wave, compared with 71.1% of the (panel) respondents to the Internet survey.

The weights for the (panel) respondents to the Internet survey aim to bring the estimate of internet access (48.4%) closer to the post-election wave.

---

<sup>2</sup> In this case the (panel) post-election wave respondents refers more specifically to those who also returned the self-completion questionnaire.

**Table 4.2 Post-election wave characteristics of Internet respondents (all waves)**

<b>Characteristics at post-election wave</b>	<b>Internet follow-up (unweighted)</b>	<b>Internet follow-up (weighted by PInWtBr)</b>	<b>Post-election cross-section (weighted by pscwtbr)</b>
	%	%	%
<i>Age-group</i>			
18-24	3.3	8.5	11.3
25-34	14.7	17.5	17.4
35-44	26.1	21.8	19.7
45-54	25.2	18.5	16.4
55-64	19.2	16.4	14.6
65-74	8.4	10.6	10.8
75+	3.1	6.6	9.8
<i>Sex</i>			
Male	50.3	47.6	48.2
Female	49.7	52.4	51.8
<i>Country</i>			
England	64.4	84.1	86.1
Scotland	21.4	10.0	8.8
Wales	14.2	5.8	5.1
<i>Internet access</i>			
Yes	71.1	48.4	46.1
No	28.9	51.6	53.9
<i>Party supporter</i>			
Yes	57.2	55.2	54.6
No	42.8	44.8	45.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>640</b>	<b>640</b>	<b>2,343</b>

Separate internet weights for panel respondents were computed for Britain, England, Scotland and Wales.

**Summary of weights for internet respondents (all waves)**

	<b>England</b>	<b>Scotland</b>	<b>Wales</b>	<b>Britain</b>
Panel respondents (pre,post,self-comp,internet)	PInWtEn	PInWtSc	PInWtWa	PInWtBr

